

In Reply to Namboodiripad's 'Idealist Views of the SUC People'

"Chintha" the official Malayam Weekly of the CPI(M) has published in its issue dated September, 2 '77 an article with the title "Idealist Views of the SUC People". In answering the questions of Questioner, Basil Joseph of Eravipuram, the article has been written by no less a person than Mr. E. M. S. Namboodiripad, the General Secretary of the CPI(M). Hence we can well take the views expressed in this article to be the official views of the CPI(M).

We are sorry to note at the outset that whatever the Questioner has placed in the name of SUCI's viewpoint on the subject has nothing in common with SUCI's thinking. Naturally, if we do not take these to be the most confused understanding of the Questioner, then surely they are motivated distortions. Secondly, not to speak of a man who claims himself to be a Marxist, it is expected of any honest person that he would first ascertain the viewpoint of his opponent before criticising it. But any reader going through this article will find that although Mr. Namboodiripad everywhere accuses SUCI of practising idealism and that too on 'ifs' and 'buts', but nowhere he feels the obligation to establish his claims by quoting from SUCI documents. And a reader will also find that everywhere he asserts in the name of Marx, Engels and Lenin but nowhere he bothers to prove his contention either by explaining what exactly they said on the questions or by quoting from them. Be that as it may, the main or the most important questions which Mr. Namboodiripad has raised in this article are as follows:

- (1) How does democratic centralism operate inside a Communist Party;
- (2) What is the exact understanding of majority-minority principle;
- (3) What is Collective leadership;
- (4) What is the difference between bourgeois individual leadership and the leading role of the leader, teacher and the guide of a proletarian revolutionary party and
- (5) What is authority conception in Marxism and how

does it differ from authoritarianism?

It is to be noted here that all these are co-related questions and can be properly understood not in isolation but in co-relation and that too, on the correct appraisal of the Leninist concept of party organisation.

How does modern science approach the question of reflection of objective reality through human brain

But before entering into the main discussion let us, first of all, examine how Mr. Namboodiripad in his bid to prove 'SUCI's practice of idealism' answers an epistemological question, unnecessarily brought in by the questioner, in the discussion on organisational matters. At one place Mr. Namboodiripad has commented: "Their (SUCI's) philosophical argument that the reflection is not a mere reflection, there is a reaction in brain and all that is nothing but an explicit expression of idealistic view which fell prey to sharp criticism of Marx, Engels and Lenin." 'Even a layman can understand that this question is related not with collective leadership but with epistemology. But here also he does not feel any obligation to place his own viewpoints on the subject, nor does he take the pain to quote from Marx, Engels and Lenin to show how and where "such opinion fell prey" to their sharp criticism. Anyhow the way he puts it, we like to say most modestly that it proves beyond doubt that he has hardly any acquaintance with the development of modern science without

(Contd. to Page 2)

Proletarian Era

ORGAN OF SOCIALIST UNITY CENTRE OF INDIA (FORTNIGHTLY)

Founder Editor-in-Chief—COMRADE SHIBDAS GHOSH

VOL. II
No. 10

15th JANUARY '78
SUNDAY

PRICE 30 P.
Air Surcharge 4 P.

Comrade Gian Singh, Secretary, Haryana State Organising Committee Condemns Police Brutalities on the Students

Rhotak—January 6:

The Haryana State Organising Committee of SUCI which concluded its meeting has today released the following statement to the Press. The meeting was presided over by Comrade Gian Singh.

"The Committee viewed with serious concern the dangerously growing trend to curb the civil and democratic rights of the people in the State. The atrocities perpetrated on the students in Panipat & Gohana recently and the brutal police lathi-charge and beating up of students' right within the college campuses at Rohtak on 6.1.78 were highly atrocious, provocative and violative of civil and democratic rights of the people.

It is our considered opinion that the adminis-

tration over-acted in imposing section 144 CrPC in Rohtak town a few days back. It is shameful for the JANATA GOVT. to resort to such high-handed measures against the people expressing their voice of protest, discontentment or dissent. The Committee considers the right of expression and demonstration as inalienable.

All sensible people will not only condemn this wanton act of the Government but will raise their voice of protest against this attack on the students and their legitimate democratic movement and will come forward to defeat all attempts to malign the legitimate student movements from agent provocateurs.

We warn the people against the dangerous

portends when the police in Haryana is again highly 'moralised' by the JANATA GOVERNMENT to suppress the people. It is high time to check the rot.

We demand immediate release of the arrested students unconditionally, due compensation to the injured and humiliated, punishment to those guilty of violating the civil & democratic rights of the people and at least public apology for trampling upon the human dignity and minimum democratic norm.

We strongly urge upon the Government to stop police interference in the democratic movements of the people forthwith and call upon the people to organise in defence of fundamental and democratic rights and liberties.

Comrade Rajwal Tyagi, on behalf of the UP State Organising Committee, Condemns Government's Repressive Measure on UP Teachers' Movement

Jaunpur—24th Dec. '77:

Condemning the UP Janata Government's high-handedness and repressive measures against the just and legitimate movement of the UP Secondary Teachers Organisation, and calling upon the democratic minded people of the State to come in active support of the movement Comrade Rajwal Tyagi, on

behalf of the Organising Committee of our Party, SUCI in UP has demanded of the state government to accept immediately the following just demands of the teachers:

- 1) The Government must take the full responsibility for free compulsory education up to ten-years course to students of the

age group of 6-16 years.

- 2) Introduction of common syllabus for all students irrespective of whether they are in public schools, convents and schools recognised by the Centre as well as the State Governments.

- 3) Primary and secondary schools should

(Contd. to Page 8)

To forget the distinction between the vanguard and the whole of the masses which gravitates towards it, means to deceive oneself and to shut one's eyes to the immensity of the task

(Contd. from Page 1)
which one cannot enter into such discussion. And we expect, Mr. Namboodiripad will do it in future.

Now let us turn a few pages of Marxian classics and see what Marx, Engels and Lenin said on it.

Marx said: 'The ideal is nothing else than the material world reflected by the human mind and translated in the form of thought'.

Engels observed 'Our consciousness and thinking, however suprasensuous they may seem, are the products of a material, bodily organ, the brain'.

And Lenin pointed out: 'Sensation, thought, consciousness are the supreme product of matter organised in a particular way'. Probably upto this point Mr. Namboodiripad will have no objection. And it is also expected that he knows that Marxism is not a dogma but a science. Hence it cannot be static—it grows and develops. Those who fail to develop Marxism continually in the light of the modern development of sciences and consider Marxian theories as something unchangeable and permanent they virtually reduce Marxism to a dogma. On the basis of recent development of sciences, particularly the brilliant work done by Pavlov, in this field, the modern science has come to the conclusion that the process is not a simple 'reflection' but an 'interaction' which Mr. Namoodiripad writes as, "reaction in the brain". Since it is a modern development of science, it is not possible for us to quote from Marx, Engels or Lenin. We, therefore, quote from Maurice Cornforth (Dialectical Materialism, Vol. III, p. 40—41). He says: "...it becomes obvious that in the process of reflection of external reality in our consciousness, the objects reflected can become considerably altered in the reflection. For, the reflection is not at all like a direct mirror-

image of the object, but is the product of a complex process of interaction in which the brain is continually active." He also says, ".....reflection is an active process conditioned by the actual relation between the organism and its surroundings." Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, the founder General Secretary of our Party, an outstanding Marxist thinker of the present era, has made unique contribution in integrating the modern developments of science and thereby confirming the fundamentals of dialectical materialism which in itself is the science of all sciences, a comprehensive science, i.e. the co-ordination of sciences.

On this particular point at issue Comrade Ghosh has brought this Leninist understanding to a new height and pointed out that this 'reflection' should better be viewed and termed as interaction between the objective world and the human brain otherwise the protagonists of idealist philosophies can very well claim that their philosophical views are also correct because they do also reflect, like any other idea, nothing but objective reality or the external world.

So, this is the position of modern science. This is how modern science has confirmed and further enriched the concept of Dialectical Materialism. Naturally, by opposing the concept of "interaction", who is opposing scientific or Marxist outlook and practising idealism—the SUCI or Mr. Namboodiripad of the CPI(M)? We would be really indebted to Mr. Namboodiripad if he can help us in future by showing how and where such a view "fell prey to sharp criticism of Marx, Engels and Lenin."

On the organisational questions also Mr. Namboodiripad has accused SUCI of practising

bourgeois idealism. And to prove this he has given his understanding about the Party Organisation and asserts that to be the Leninist concept, though nowhere he quotes Lenin to prove his contention.

Mr. Namboodiripad's concept of party organisation is opposed to Leninist concept

Now, us examine how far Namboodiripad's concept of Party conforms with that of Lenin and see who really practises idealism—the SUCI or the CPI(M)?

Mr. Namboodiripad says:

(1) Engels and Lenin characterised party organisation as a part of the activity to strengthen the camp of the proletariat in the class struggle going on in the three spheres namely economic, political and ideological.

(2) Party's task is to co-ordinate the most revolutionary trend of thinking and most revolutionary social movements by co-relating the aspirations and experiences of the proletariat and general democratic movement with a scientific view.

(3) The source of any view right or wrong is the ideas and aspirations which give shape to the interests of this or that class. These class interests get expressed in the form of different political parties and mass organisations. Then, there should be a vanguard detachment which stands firmly by and fights uncompromisingly for the interests of the working class in the constant struggle going on between and inside most of these parties and mass organisations. And that is party.

Now, to help Mr. Namboodiripad, let us place what Lenin said about a Marxist-Leninist Party. In his celebrated book, 'One Step Forward Two Steps Back', Lenin said, as put by Stalin: "The party differs from other detach-

ments of the working class primarily by the fact that it is not an ordinary detachment, but the vanguard detachment, the class-conscious detachment, a Marxist detachment of the working class, armed with a knowledge of the life of society, of the laws of the class struggle, and for this reason, able to lead the working class and to direct its class struggle. The Party must, therefore, not be confused with the working class, as the part must not be confused with the whole." (Emphasis added) (History of the CPSU(B), Moscow, 1951, page 78-79). But Mr. Namboodiripad in the name of Lenin distorts this Leninist concept of the leading role of the party when he twists this as 'a part of the working class', as a 'part of the activity to strengthen the camp of the proletariat' thereby reducing the vanguard detachment to an ordinary detachment of the working class. When Lenin conceives the party as the vanguard detachment, which leads all struggles and activities of the working class, Mr. Namboodiripad reduces it to a mere part of many activities of the proletariat. Thus, he, in a very subtle way, much more surreptitiously than the Mensheviks, negates the leading role of the party and reduces it to an ordinary organisation of the working class. Yet they claim their party to be a Marxist Party! So, such is the understanding of Mr. Namboodiripad about the characteristics of Marxist-Leninist Party. Wonderful! A wonderful understanding of Lenin indeed and that is also not of an ordinary member but of the General Secretary of the Party! If even after this we, in place of admitting the CPI(M) as a Marxist-Leninist Party, characterise it as a petty-bourgeois party then it

would really be very very bad!

Similar confusion of Mr. Namboodiripad will be found in another place where he writes, "...it is not Shibdas Ghosh or some other person at the leadership but it is the collective practical experience of the proletariat and other working masses that judges right and wrong". It may appear to be very democratic at the first sight. But to a critical eye it will be clear that it is nothing else than a Menshevik trash; an attempt, though in a very subtle way, to confuse the party with the class and the masses and thereby to negate the leading role of the party and the leadership.

Not only that, to put this point in this way is to lower the party even below the level of consciousness of the ordinary members of the working class and to reduce the Marxist Party to a 'tail-piece' of the masses. How Mr. Namboodiripad has confused the question of the leading role of the leader, teacher, guide and the personified expression of the collective leadership of the party by raising the point of the great leader of the proletariat Comrade Shibdas Ghosh—we will discuss it later on. But about another point, i.e. the leading role of the party itself let us see what was the teaching of Lenin on this particular point. Lenin wrote: "But it will be Manilovism and Khvostism to think that at any time under capitalism the entire class, or almost the entire class, would be able to rise to the level of consciousness and activity of its vanguard.....To forget this distinction between the vanguard and the whole of the masses which gravitates towards it, to forget the constant duty of the vanguard to raise ever wider strata to this most advanced level, means

(Contd. to Page 3)

(Contd. from Page 2)
merely to deceive oneself, to shut one's eyes to the immensity of our tasks, and to narrow down these tasks." (Lenin, Selected Works Eng. Ed. Moscow, 1947 Vol. I p. 294). Again Lenin showed: "The history of all countries shows that the working class, exclusively by its own effort, is able to develop only Trade Union consciousness, that is, the conviction that it is necessary to combine in unions, fight the employers and strike to compel the Government to pass necessary labour legislation etc." (What Is To Be Done—P. 30). And see again how Mr. Namboodiripad further negates the leading role of the Marxist-Leninist party. He says: "Party's task is to co-ordinate (Emphasis added) the most revolutionary..... trends of thinking and most revolutionary social movements by co-relating the aspirations and experiences of the proletariat and general democratic movement with a scientific view." So according to Mr. Namboodiripad already there exists "revolutionary thinking" in the masses and "revolutionary social movements" develop spontaneously in the society and the task of the Marxist party is just to 'co-ordinate' them. Mr. Namboodiripad says it to be Leninist. But the history of the communist movement will reveal beyond doubt that it is that old theory of spontaneity of the 'Economists' of Lenin's time, surreptitiously smuggled in here under revolutionary phrases. Let us see what Lenin says about this concept of spontaneity of revolutionary thinking and movement. In his celebrated work "What is To Be Done", Lenin writes:

"Thus, socialist consciousness is something introduced into the proletarian class struggle from without and not something that arose within it spontaneously." (page 38)

The party is not just a Co-ordinator or Recorder of events

Then again, Lenin in the same book, as summarised

by Stalin says: "...to extoll this spontaneous process in the working class movement, to deny that the Party had a leading role to play, to reduce its role to that of a recorder of events, meant to preach Khvostism (following in the tail), to preach the conversion of the party into a tail-piece of the spontaneous process into a passive force of the movement, capable only of contemplating the spontaneous process and allowing events to take their own course. To advocate this meant working for the destruction of the Party, that is, leaving the working class without a party, that is, leaving the working class unarmed". (History of CPSU (B), Moscow, 1951, page-64) (Emphasis added). In this book, (What Is To Be Done) as pointed out by Stalin, Lenin "brought out the great importance of theory of consciousness and of the

"The proletariat can become and will inevitably become an invincible force when its ideological unity around the principles of Marxism is consolidated by the material unity of an organisation"

party as a revolutionising and guiding force of the spontaneous working class movements." But Mr. Namboodiripad reduces the role of the party to a 'co-ordinator' of this spontaneous working class movement and the so-called revolutionary thinking existing in the society while the "Economists" reduced it to a 'recorder of events'. Still Mr. Namboodiripad claims his party to be Leninist! He has only chewed the old cud of the 'Economists' after more than 70 years of struggles and experiences of the proletariat. But this is not all. Mr. Namboodiripad writes:

"The source of any view, right or wrong, is the ideas and aspirations which give shape to the interests of this class or that class. These class interests get expressed in the form of different political parties and mass organisations such as trade unions and peasant orga-

nisations. Then, there should be a vanguard detachment which stands firmly by and fights uncompromisingly for the interests of the working class in the constant struggle going on between and inside most of these parties and mass organisations. And that is Party."

Thanks to Mr. Namboodiripad. Though he tried utmost to keep the cat inside the bag creating a philosophical air outwardly but at last he himself brought it out.

An attempt to provide theoretical justification for political opportunism

This unique theoretical analysis of Mr. Namboodiripad, so long quite unknown to the Marxist-Leninists, explains why the CPI(M) leaders often find progressive sections in different parties like Muslim League, Kerala Congress, DMK, AIDMK, Akali or even in parties like Indira Congress and

If it is simply a co-ordinator then it can never be a vanguard; on the contrary, if it is the vanguard then it does not simply co-ordinate but provides correct leadership to all the struggles of the masses to lead the working class to power. But this is only possible when it does not lose sight of the all-important question of establishing its hegemony over all these struggles. Not to establish the hegemony of the working class means not to play the leading role of the vanguard. And this is exactly what has happened with Mr. Namboodiripad. By losing sight of this important task, he has actually negated the leading role of the party and thereby reduced the vanguard to the position of a simple co-ordinator. Thus by objectively negating the leading role of the Marxist-Leninist party, and by reducing the party to a mere 'co-ordinator' of the so-called 'revolutionary trend

—V. I. LENIN

of thinking' and 'most revolutionary social movements'. Mr. Namboodiripad says, "that is the party". That is a party, no doubt, of which he is the General Secretary, but what type of a party? A Marxist party? Or a revisionist party of the worst form?

Does the majority-minority principle by itself establish democratic centralism?

Mr. Namboodiripad has charged that our party do not adhere to the majority-minority principle and instead of practising democratic centralism and collective leadership we are maintaining the approach of bourgeois idealism and individual leadership. So let us see on these question also who is really practising idealism?—The SUCI or the CPI(M)? To start discussion on these we like to, at the very outset, point out one gross distortion of SUCI's stand, made by the questioner, which Mr.

Namboodiripad capitalises very cleverly. Our party while discussing organisational questions has said it clearly that "it may sometimes be necessary even in a Communist Party to act as per majority decision to which the minority has to submit most happily and voluntarily; but such a decision cannot be taken on the questions of ideology and principle." But thoroughly distorting this stand of the SUCI the pet questioner of Namboodiripad writes: "They say in no case, in no issue decision should be taken on majority-minority principle." And Mr. Namboodiripad without ascertaining the stand of the SUCI at once jumps to conclude, "if the SUCI people handle the question of organisation as narrated by the questioner then we cannot but say that their philosophical basis is not materialism or Marxism-Leninism but bourgeois idealism." Unique a style indeed! So, we are to believe that this is materialism which depends not on objective truth but on mere assumption, absurd hypothesis, heresay or conjecture or to put it bluntly on 'ifs and buts'. If this is not subjectivism, bourgeois idealism then what else is? Will Mr. Namboodiripad answer?

Secondly, from the whole approach of Mr. Namboodiripad, it is evident that he considers majority minority principle to be democratic centralism itself; or, in other words, he reduces democratic centralism to mere majority-minority principle. Lenin defined democratic centralism as "the fusion between proletarian democracy and centralism" though while discussing organisational questions he also mentioned about the submission of minority to the majority. Now, if anybody, completely ignoring the very fundamental aspect of proletarian democracy, from this formulation of Lenin takes mere majority-minority principle as democratic centralism itself, then will he not take only a formal

(Contd. to Page 4)

(Contd. from Page 3)

aspect of democratic centralism rejecting its very essence, its life and soul and thereby fall prey to bourgeois idealism? And Mr. Namboodiripad exactly has done the very same mistake. Thirdly, if democratic centralism is majority-minority principle itself then, may we ask, do not the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois parties also work on this very principle? At least most of them, of course, do. Then from this will it be proper to conclude that the bourgeois and the petty-bourgeois parties also are democratically centralised? Those who conclude like this commit a dangerous mistake because they equate the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois parties with the revolutionary party of the proletariat which Mr. Namboodiripad has done.

This unique (!) understanding of democratic centralism is not also new to Mr. Namboodiripad. And he does not even see any credit of Lenin in enunciating this principle because he finds nothing new in it. In one of his earlier articles, Mr. Namboodiripad writes: "These principles of democratic centralism are not new political thinking. They are the guiding lines of all progressives; they in fact, guided the functioning of the Congress in the day of anti-imperialist struggle." (New Age, May, '62, P. 13) See, how simple has become the concept of democratic centralism, to Mr. Namboodiripad, the living soul of a Communist Party organisation. Still he will make us believe that the CPI(M)'s concept of democratic centralism is Leninist. When Mr. Namboodiripad would claim that the Congress was democratically centralised during the anti-imperialist struggle, it is no wonder to-day that he claims CPI(M) also to be democratically centralised! And it is also nothing astonishing that a man who finds the principle of democratic centralism operative even in the bourgeois parties, will find SUCI practising idealism!

When on the basis of ideological centralism to develop one process of thinking, uniformity of thinking, oneness in approach and singleness of purpose based on Marxism-Leninism covering all aspects of life the organisational centralism is built up, it then gives the real structural shape of democratic centralism inside the Party

—COMRADE SHIBDAS GHOSH

What is democratic centralism?

Now let us see what is the Leninist concept of democratic centralism and what is the particular type of struggle to be conducted to build up democratic centralism inside the party. We know, whenever Lenin spoke of democracy, he always differentiated proletarian democracy from bourgeois democracy. Naturally, when Lenin speaks of democratic centralism, surely he does not mean thereby a fusion of bourgeois democracy and centralism, but precisely a fusion between proletarian democracy and centralism. Elaborating this point of Lenin to show clearly where and how proletarian democracy differs from bourgeois democracy, our beloved leader, teacher and guide Comrade Shibdas Ghosh says: "In a class-divided society the concept of democracy cannot be one and the same; it is a class concept. It must be either bourgeois democracy reflecting private ownership, private control over production and bourgeois way of life, that is individualism; or proletarian democracy reflecting collective ownership, collective control over production and distribution and proletarian way of life, that is collective way of life." If Mr. Namboodiripad could understand this then he could easily realise why the Leninist principle of democratic centralism, being the reflection of proletarian way of life, can be practised only by the revolutionary party of the proletariat and never by a bourgeois or petty-bourgeois party which is historically bound to reflect bourgeois way of life. But, we are constrained to say that Mr. Namboodiripad has muddled the

entire thing on this very point.

It is quite natural that he could not also understand the Leninist concept of building up of democratic centralism inside the party. Anyone who has correctly realised Marxism-Leninism knows that it is the complex and painstaking struggle of developing ideological centralism inside the party. Lenin says, "..... the proletariat can become and will inevitably become an invincible force when its ideological unity around the principles of Marxism is consolidated by the material unity of an organisation." (Lenin: Selected Works, Vol. 11, p. 466). And Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, our beloved leader and teacher, in one of his landmarking works "Why SUCI is the Only Communist Party on Indian Soil", beautifully elaborating this Leninist conception of party organisation says: "If we can dissect democratic centralism as in Anatomy, we shall find two parts, the one ideological centralism and the other organisational centralism. Now, this ideological centralism grows out of the struggle to develop one process of thinking, uniformity of thinking, oneness in approach and singleness of purpose based on Marxism-Leninism, that is, Dialectical Materialism, not only on economic and political questions, but on all questions covering all aspects of life. When a party, through such an all out struggle has been able to develop this ideological centralism, then and then only it can be said that the principle of democratic centralism is operating inside the party..... When on the basis of this ideological centralism, which makes the proletarian democracy effective, the

organisational centralism is built up, it then gives the real structural shape of the principle of democratic centralism inside the party." (Proletarian Era, 1st November, 1976). And that is why Lenin said that the democratic centralism can be established in a party only through the fusion of proletarian democracy and centralism. Only this process guarantees the monolithic character of the party. This concrete and enriched understanding of the Leninist principle of democratic centralism by Comrade Shibdas Ghosh clearly points out wherein lies the real essence, the inner kernel, of democratic centralism. Comrade Ghosh further showed that to ensure democratic centralism, a communist party has to constantly conduct a conscious and uncompromising struggle covering all aspects of life against bourgeois outlook, ideology and culture and in this process raise the level of revolutionary consciousness of the party cadres to such a minimum standard that enables all of them, or at least most of them, to express their thoughts in an articulate form, i.e. they are able to take active part in the ideological struggle, in all theoretical discussions in the form of dialogue. When such a minimum level of revolutionary consciousness and culture is attained even by the rank and file of the party then and then only a dialectical relation amongst the leaders and the members of the party can be established. Comrade Ghosh shows: "In absence of struggles and discussion in dialogue in party bodies, democratic centralism is bound to be degenerated objectively, into practice of centralism based on formal democracy, which

in its wake gives birth to bureaucratic leadership at the top isolated from the rank and file at the bottom, the dialectical process of thinking is replaced by a mechanical process of thinking and the dialectical relation between leaders and the rank and file is replaced by a mechanical relation." So, democratic centralism does not come into being merely by the adoption of a model democratic constitution on the basis of majority-minority principle, as Mr. Namboodiripad has viewed. The real foundation of democratic centralism is the high ideological-cultural standard of the rank and file of the party.

The pet questioner of Mr. Namboodiripad has sarcastically commented against us: "They call it struggle. In their opinion it is not appropriate to call it discussions." Yes, we do not call it a discussion in the sense of ordinary discussion but a 'discussion in dialogue' which presupposes struggle and which depend mainly on the necessary ideological standard of the member of the party and on their conscious proletarian revolutionary role. May be, this struggle is absent in the CPI(M), but this is not the case with SUCI. We think that this intense ideological struggle inside the party is necessary, not only to raise the level of consciousness of not only the leaders and the rank and file but also to raise the ideological and cultural standard of the class and the masses which is so very essential for the success and guarantee of revolution. Moreover, we think, this process of educating the rank and file members of the party, the class and the masses is also the concrete process of learning even from the masses. Those leaders and political parties who take people or the common masses as 'insensible' and prefer to keep them so, actually deny the necessity of this struggle. And by doing so they virtually refuse also to learn from the masses. Moreover, if this discussion does not mean struggle and

(Contd. to Page 5)

As the object of Socialist Revolution is to establish social ownership and as it is a revolution to establish collective control over the means of production under the leadership of the proletariat, the concept of leadership in proletarian democracy is bound to be collective

(Contd. from Page 4)

interaction of ideas, it will mean mere argumentation and gossip. It will mean that the object of all discussion inside the party, i.e. the inner-party discussion is virtually reduced to accepting whatever comes from the leader as truth without any examination and to avoid the struggle to get at truth. However much Mr. Namboodiripad may claim that, "the constant discussion between that leadership and rank and file and between the whole party and the masses..... form the basis of activity and development of the party"—all these discussions are bound to meet with the fate just mentioned. Still Mr. Namboodiripad claims that his party is democratically centralised!

So, in short, the CPI(M) believes that democratic centralism is the guiding line of all the progressive parties, that is, even of the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois parties. It also believes that any party, irrespective of its class character, can be democratically centralised if it simply works on the majority-minority principle. While the SUCI believes that democratic centralism is, historically, the organisational principle of a revolutionary party of the proletariat and therefore, can never be practised by any bourgeois and petty-bourgeois party, it also believes that democratic centralism can develop in a party only when the organisational centralism is built on the foundation of ideological centralism covering all aspects of life, on the basis of Marxism-Leninism. So, will Mr. Namboodiripad answer now, which party, the SUCI or the CPI(M) is practising bourgeois idealism?

The question of collective leadership

Now, let us see what is the understanding of Mr. Namboodiripad about collective leadership. Mr. Namboodiripad in his article says his 'party does not consider any leader as the person who reflects the correct view in the best form' but considers committee decision itself to be the collective leadership and for that he claims his party, the CPI(M) believes in collective leadership. What a unique contribution in the treasury of Marxism-Leninism! And, as SUCI regards Comrade Shibdas Ghosh as the personified and concretised expression of the collective knowledge of the party and hence the leader, teacher and guide of the proletariat, Mr. Namboodiripad accuses SUCI of believing in individual leadership. So, let us examine the subject on the anvil of Marxism-Leninism.

Lenin showed that the leadership of every real communist party is collectively leadership and historically it is the concept of the proletariat class. Tracing history and elaborating this teaching of Lenin, Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, an outstanding Marxist thinker of the era, showed: "Bourgeois revolution is a revolutionary transformation of productive forces and mode of production based on individual ownership over means of production and after all a revolution to ensure the development of individual. So even in the model bourgeois democracy, whatever model democratic form it may assume, it is the individual leadership which is bound to operate.....But as the object of socialist revolution is to establish social ownership and as it is a revolution to establish collective control over the means of produc-

tion under the leadership of the proletariat, the concept of leadership in proletarian democracy is bound to be collective." But what does this collective leadership actually mean? In reply to CPI(M)'s 'A word to the SUC' published in Proletarian Era dated 1st June, 1973, we said, "It should be understood that discussions and decisions on major problems in party bodies, however indispensable they may be, do not, by themselves, establish collective leadership. Even in bourgeois and petty-bourgeois parties discussions and decisions on major problems in party bodies take place. But no Marxist-Leninist will, on this ground, say that collective leadership operates in the petty-bourgeois and bourgeois parties. As such discussions and decisions are at best committee decisions. Collective leadership is not just a committee decision. Social consciousness in the form of collective knowledge of all the members of the party is collective leadership. Then again, the concept of collective leadership is not abstract; it is always concrete. In other words, collective knowledge of all the members of the party must have a concretised form of expressing itself through a leader who best expresses this collective knowledge of the party covering all aspects of life and society. Thus collective leadership can be defined as follows: "Collective leadership is the collective knowledge derived from the struggles conducted by the leaders, the ranks, the class and the masses, personified, concretised and expressed in the best way through a person in the highest organism of the party". In a

party where this personified and concretised form of expression of the collective knowledge has not emerged, it cannot be said that collective leadership operates there...In fact, the struggle for the emergence of collective leadership in personified and concretised form within the party involving the leaders and the ranks and outside the class and the masses is the real struggle for the building up of a real Communist Party. In the absence of the emergence of this personified and concretised form, collective leadership objectively becomes the practice of formal or average bourgeois democracy. The emergence of collective leadership in personified and concretised form is an indispensable pre-condition for the victory of revolution in any country."

We are proud that in the process of developing democratic centralism and establishing collective leadership inside the party through intense ideological struggles covering all aspects of life on the basis of Marxism-Leninism, SUCI has been able to give birth to this personified and concretised form of collective leadership through Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, a giant communist thinker of this era, which CPI(M) has failed to achieve after a long years of struggle. For this we understand the cause of annoyance and anger of theirs. But how can we help them in this regard? According to Mr. Namboodiripad, or that of CPI(M) this personified and concretised expression of collective leadership is nothing but individual leadership. Very well! Now, let us examine it.

Collective leadership is not just a committee decision

We hope, Mr. Namboodiripad will definitely agree with us that Bolshevik Party during the time of Lenin was able to give birth to collective leadership, to be more perfect, a beautiful model of collective leadership. But since Lenin said that, "collective knowledge of all the members of the party is collective leadership"—will Mr.

Namboodiripad say that, not Lenin, but the collective knowledge of all the members of the Bolshevik Party that constituted its leadership? Can these two be counterposed? Again, when we say Marxism-Leninism, does it mean individualism, because Marx and Lenin were after all individuals? Can any man having even a modicum of understanding of Marxism-Leninism say like this? They were individuals, no doubt. But the thinking of Marx or the thinking of Lenin was not just Marx's thinking or Lenin's thinking in a subjective way but the personified expression of the social thinking in a best way which is also collective leadership. Comrade Shibdas Ghosh said, ".....just as the thinking of a committee composed of several individuals can be under the impact of and may actually reflect individual trend of thinking, so also the collective knowledge of the members and workers of the party can get the best expression through an individual. Social thinking in the form of collective knowledge of the members of the party personified through an individual is also collective leadership."

(Proletarian Era, November Special, 1976.)

Now, in whom this collective knowledge of the party is concretised and personified in the best way, he emerges as the leader of all leaders, the teacher, the guide of the party. We all know that in his life time, Lenin was the leader of all other leaders, including Stalin, of the Bolshevik Party. He was the thinker, the leader, the teacher and guide of the party. Even when Lenin was sick and bed-ridden and Stalin was the General Secretary of the Party Lenin remained the leader and teacher of the party, all other leaders from the core of their heart believed it and expressed it without reservation in public. We quote here very modestly for the knowledge of Mr. Namboodiripad a historic remark of Comrade Stalin on Lenin. In one of his memorable

(Contd. to Page 6)

Modern revisionism is the most dangerous social support of imperialism-capitalism

(Contd. from Page 5)

works Comrade Stalin said "When I compared him with the other leaders of our party, it always seemed to me that he was head and shoulder above his colleagues... Lenin was not just one of the leaders, but a leader of the highest rank". Will Mr. Namboodiripad enlighten us what does this evaluation of Stalin mean? Is it individual leadership? No. It means that Lenin was the leader of all leaders. In the Communist Party of China also Mao Tsetung was considered to be the leader, teacher and guide and the personified and concretised expression of collective leadership of the party. Likewise Ho Chi Minh was considered as the leader of all leaders in the Communist Party of Vietnam. Such is the phenomenon of leadership in all the genuine Communist Parties. But since Lenin, Stalin, Mao Tsetung, Ho Chi Minh are after all individuals, will Mr. Namboodiripad dare say that these parties also believed in individual leadership? Namboodiripad says: "The CPI(M) is advancing itself and trying to advance the revolutionary mass movement in the process of fight against this. The party does not accept any leader as 'the person who reflects the correct views in the best form'. This is quite frank an admission. Mr. Namboodiripad here confesses that the CPI(M) opposes the concrete concept of collective leadership and that in his party there is no leader who is considered by all other members of the Central Committee and other leaders of the party as the leader, teacher and guide of the party. That is, in his party, they are all leaders; all parallel leaders. This we knew already. And this had been our exact observation about the CPI(M) although. Elaborating the Leninist concept of leadership Com. Ghosh pointedly showed that parallel leadership in a communist party is untenable with the Leninist concept of leadership of a proletarian revolutionary

party, because the existence of parallel leaders within a party clearly shows the existence of parallel groups centring round each leader. When groupism raises its ugly head, the existence of groups become palpable. At other times, when groupism does not come to the surface, the unity of the party is not disturbed. In such parties, leaders of the party do not emerge through the collective process of struggle covering all aspects of life, but are imposed leaders; selected through adjustments and compromise between the groups. And that is the exact position of CPI(M). But, any Marxist-Leninist knows that these are all characteristic features of bourgeois and petty-bourgeois parties and actually that is called bourgeois individualist leadership. Then who is practising individual leadership—the SUCI or the CPI(M)? Will Mr. Namboodiripad answer?

It is quite natural that a man who fails to understand the essence of democratic centralism and the concretised and personified expression of the collective leadership will find it more difficult to properly comprehend the complicated historic process of emergence of the great leaders of the proletariat as well as the historic significance of the role played by them. In this era, as we have already seen, no individual can emerge as the leader, teacher and guide of the proletariat without identifying himself with the struggle of the proletariat and without playing the leading role in organising and guiding the proletarian revolutionary movements. These great leaders of the proletariat—Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin, Mao Tsetung, Shibdas Ghosh—all are the concretised and personified expressions of the knowledge and experiences of the world proletarian revolutionary movement at different stages of its development. So, their emergence as great leaders of the world proletariat is

neither accidental nor an imposed phenomenon, but is historic in nature. These great individuals emerged in history as the leaders of the proletariat in course of struggle not just by surrendering, but precisely by identifying their individual interests with the interests of the class, the revolution and the party.

Again, see how Mr. Namboodiripad, true to his social democratic belief maligns these great leaders of the proletariat. He writes: "Talented persons who are prepared to submit their individuality to the organisation and its collective leadership in the process of democratic centralism can play very important role in the growth of the movement. Marx, Engels and Lenin are examples of this." First, we all know that Engels once observed, "We are at best talented persons but Marx is a genius." It was the modesty of Engels that he called himself a talented person but did not fail to call Marx a genius. But see how easily Mr. Namboodiripad calls all these giant leaders of the proletariat simply talented persons but does not find their genius. Secondly, the way he expresses the point of 'talented persons', it appears that he thinks that there are persons who are 'born talents', which is nothing but an idealist view. The materialist view in this regard is that men are not born talents, there are no inborn geniuses, they are the products of the process. Thirdly, from the above remark of Mr. Namboodiripad it may appear at the very first sight to be a praise to these great leaders. But a critical examination will show that it is the greatest slur against Marx, Engels and Lenin.

The Communists throughout the world know that these great leaders of the proletariat were not just 'talented persons' who developed outside the revolutionary movement of the proletariat and were just prepared to submit to

the organisation, but were the greatest thinkers of the era and the pioneers, builders and guides of the revolutionary movements of the proletariat and were totally identified with the class and revolution. But, Mr. Namboodiripad most subtly attempts here to make the proletariat believe as if these great leaders developed as "talented persons" outside the orbit of the proletarian revolutionary movement but as they were prepared to submit their individuality to the organisation they could play important role in the growth of the movement. What can be a greater denigration of these great leaders of the proletariat? This most surreptitious attempt of denigrating these great leaders of the proletariat is nothing but the worst and subtlest craft of the modern revisionists to infiltrate bourgeois ideologies in the working class movement and thus mislead it. That is the position of the revisionists who talk of Marxism but in fact do great disservice to the cause of Marxist movements. This is why, Lenin said: "The dialectics of history are such that the theoretical victory of Marxism obliged its enemies to disguise themselves as Marxists."

Thus after most subtly and surreptitiously preparing the ground for revisionism Mr. Namboodiripad makes direct attack on Stalin and Mao with a view to undermining the authority of these two great leaders of the proletariat. He writes: "There are some prominent individuals also who once played brilliant role in the development of the movement but by usurping all its victories to their personal credit did harm to the movement. Leaders like Stalin and Mao belong to this category." It is no wonder that when Mr. Namboodiripad has called Marx a talented person he will call Stalin and Mao prominent individuals. No doubt, every man acts

according to his standard. But, may we request Mr. Namboodiripad to cite a single instance where Stalin and Mao usurped the victories of the movement to their personal credit? Otherwise, is it not unethical to pass comment like this, even if it is made against an ordinary man? Secondly, does Mr. Namboodiripad think that the attribution of the achievements and victories of the working class and the people to Stalin and Mao mean negation of the role played by the working class and the people of Russia or China, of which these two giant leaders were the builders and guides? If it really means so, then it will mean in case of Lenin too. But when it is said that Lenin was the founder of the first socialist state in the world, does it mean that Lenin did it alone? Does this attribution of achievements and victories of the proletariat and the party to Lenin negate their role? It means none of these. To a communist it means just an expression of giving recognition to the leading role of Lenin as the builder and guide of the socialist revolution in Russia. And Comrade Shibdas Ghosh taught us that this is the correct way of appreciating the values of the great leaders without which a communist can never raise his ideological standard and play due revolutionary role. But see how inconsistent the CPI(M) leader is. He accuses Stalin and Mao of usurping the credit of revolutionary movements but at the same time writes: "It was Lenin and the Bolshevik Party and Communist International which developed under his leadership etc., etc." Then, why is this belittling of the historic role played by Stalin and Mao, two great leaders of the proletariat? Is it very difficult to understand that this attack on Stalin and Mao is nothing but that revisionist attempt to discard the very Marxist sense of authority?

(Contd. to Page 7)

The only course to root out the cult of individual is to banish for good the mechanical understanding of the sense of authority and to replace it by dialectical sense of authority

(Contd. from Page 6)

Marxist concept of authority is not authoritarianism

The communists know that in Marxism sense of authority works. But the Marxist concept of authority as **Comrade Ghosh** has pointed out, is not authoritarianism which precludes struggle with the authority and is based on a blind acceptance of authority and considers authority infallible. Marxist sense of authority does not preclude, rather presupposes struggle with the authority precisely with the object of uniting with and strengthening it. The tendency of negating Marxist sense of authority is nothing but a revisionist tendency of discarding Marxism itself. Because without a sense of authority Marxism falls prey to all sorts of bourgeois and petty-bourgeois distortions and deviations. In his celebrated work, "On steps taken by CPSU against Stalin", **Comrade Ghosh** exposed this heinous attempt of the modern revisionists, defended and upheld Marxism-Leninism thus: "This tendency, if not fought right now, is apt to develop among a section of the communists with the low level of consciousness the anarchist idea of ultra-democracy which is not only fundamentally opposed to Marxism-Leninism but also a subtle means to establish the most rotten type of authority, namely, individual dictatorship under the cover of anti-authority phrase-mongering in party life."

We know, Mr. Namboodiripad in discarding Stalin's and Mao's authority adopts no new tactics. In tune with the revisionists elsewhere he fans up the ultra-democratic sentiments prevailing in the society. As the proletarian sense of democracy, proletarian culture, and the proletarian sense of organisation and leadership are yet to grow in our social movement as well as throughout the world and

as bourgeois sense of ultra-democracy, individualism, ego-centrism are all predominant, there exists already a tendency of discarding Marxist sense of authority. In fear of the growth of proletarian revolutionary movement, the ruling bourgeois class all through attempted and are still attempting to fan up this rotten individualism, ego-centrism and ultra-democratic tendencies with the sole object of obstructing the projection of proletarian revolutionary leadership lest the exploited masses get organised under it.

Modern revisionism is the most dangerous social support of imperialism-capitalism

History shows that, as a trend of bourgeois class movement within the working class, social democracy of different shades do this service to the bourgeois class in a better and subtler way. The social-democrats, in order to distort Marxism-Leninism, all through tried to tarnish the image of Marxist authorities. And modern revisionism, as pointed out by **Comrade Ghosh**, is the most dangerous social support of imperialism-capitalism—it is the compromising force between imperialism and liberation struggles and between capitalism and anti-capitalist revolutionary struggles. This is why the Khrushchevite revisionists in the name of fighting 'cult of the individual' concentrated their whole attack on **Comrade Stalin** and **Comrade Mao**. But the proletariat and other exploited masses should understand that unless, through a conscious and continuous struggle, they can produce the concrete concept of their collective leadership through an individual they can neither build up their own revolutionary party nor accomplish the task of revolution. Lenin showed that "Not a single class in history has achieved power without producing its political leaders, its prominent

representatives, able to organise a movement and lead it." (Collected Works Vol. 4; page 370). Only with the emergence of Lenin's and afterwards Stalin's leadership in Russia, Mao's leadership in China and Ho-Chin-Minh's leadership in Vietnam, revolutionary movements of those countries grew, developed and became victorious. India cannot be an exception to this and historically no country can be.

During the whole period of national movement of our country although the working class and other exploited masses took active part and made sacrifices much more than the bourgeoisie, still they failed to produce their own leader, build up their own revolutionary party and thus establish their leadership over the national independence struggle. Taking advantage of this weakness of the working class movement in India, the Indian bourgeoisie established its leadership over the anti-imperialist independence movement and reaped the harvest of it and established a capitalist state. But the struggle of the working class was not altogether a failure. Though late, the proletariat of India, through this prolonged and painstaking struggles, has been ultimately able to produce its own Party, the Socialist Unity Centre of India and its leader through the gigantic personality and genius of **Comrade Shibdas Ghosh**. 'It was **Comrade Shibdas Ghosh** who concretised Marxism-Leninism on Indian soil, developed, elaborated and enriched many aspects of it and brought many other aspects to a new height at this particular stage of the present era of imperialism and proletarian revolution enunciated by Lenin. He also provided a newer and concrete understanding of Marxism-Leninism in course of dealing with the problems that appeared not only in the political and socio-economic fields, but also covering all aspects of life and epistemology, science

and philosophy, ethics, morality, culture, art, literature and aesthetics in the post-Lenin period. It was **Comrade Shibdas Ghosh** who built up the genuine revolutionary party of the proletariat in India and thus historically emerged as the great leader of the toiling millions and the concretised and personified expression of the collective leadership of the great revolutionary party of the Indian proletariat, the Socialist Unity Centre of India. 'His contributions to the ideological field of the international communist movement made him a communist leader of unique distinction and a giant Marxist authority of our time. At this stage of the present era, it is not possible to have an adequate understanding of Marxism-Leninism without the understanding of **Comrade Shibdas Ghosh**. He was the first to point out that modern revisionism reformism was the main danger in the international communist movement and showed the correct line of struggle against it. His brilliant exposure of modern revisionism has unarmed not only Khrushchev but also his followers all over the world. And that it will cause anger in the revisionist camp is quite expected. This explains why after making attacks on Stalin and Mao Tse-tung Mr. Namboodiripad finally concentrates his whole attack on the SUCI and its leader, teacher and guide **Comrade Shibdas Ghosh**. He says: "Some people can be found who cannot claim of having the brilliant talent of Stalin and Mao and who cannot contribute anything coming anywhere near to the contributions of those leaders to the movement, yet believe in cult of individual like them and try to make their followers believe in it. From the quotations given by the questioner it is to be understood that SUCI people view **Comrade Shibdas Ghosh** as such a person."

And further to belittle the image of **Comrade**

Shibdas Ghosh, Mr. Namboodiripad applied his worst tactics of bracketing the SUCI's struggle to spread the revolutionary thoughts and teachings of **Comrade Shibdas Ghosh** with the Naxalites' blind practice of projecting Chairman Mao and Mr. Charu Mazumdar.

We hope that by this time, from the entire discussion made above, the SUCI's concept of concrete and personified expression of collective leadership and its sense of authority, just opposed to cult of individual or authoritarianism, are explicitly clear to any honest reader. It was SUCI which for the first time theoretically showed to the people how this practice of the Naxalites suffered from blind authoritarianism. We would request Mr. Namboodiripad to go through some historic works of **Comrade Shibdas Ghosh** such as 'Self-criticism of the Communist Camp', 'On steps taken by CPSU against Stalin', 'An Appeal to the leaders of the International Communist Movement', 'Cultural Revolution of China', 'Why SUCI is the only Communist Party in India', to mention a few, wherein **Comrade Ghosh** has shown clearly the root cause of authoritarianism and the way to fight it out, but at the same time upheld the Marxist sense of authority.

It is not the history of that distant past that Mr. Namboodiripad and his friends in the CPI(M) will forget that when during Stalin's life time they all (in the united CPI) were in the habit of hurrah making in the name of Stalin, when they were thoroughly submerged in the sea of blind authoritarianism it was **Comrade Shibdas Ghosh** who showed as far back as in 1948 to the world communists: "While acknowledging with just pride and deference the very many achievements and successes and glorious sacrifices of the world communist

(Contd. to Page 8)

Rally round SUCI that upholds the Revolutionary banner of Marxism-Leninism

(Contd. from Page 7)

movement, we have not failed even for a moment, to point out the serious short-comings in it. All the genuine communists who do not want to be swayed away by self-deception in the name of self-criticism and want to adopt a revolutionary programme of action to get rid of the crisis with the help of scientific process of analysis instead of being influenced by any sort of blind emotion or bias, cannot gloss over the serious short-comings and will have to scientifically probe deep into it."

"These serious short comings and defects are largely due to the fact that the present leadership of the world communist camp is, to a large extent, influenced by mechanical process of thinking."

And it was Comrade Shibdas Ghosh who again as far back as in 1956, just after the 20th Congress of the CPSU, showed to the world communists the root cause of cult of individual and how to fight it out. As opposed to Khrushchev's move of de-Stalinisation he wrote, "Hence, the only course to root out the cult of individual and eliminate its baneful effects is to banish for good the mechanical understanding of the sense of authority and replace it by dialectical understanding of the sense of authority, shun the practice of centralism based on formal democracy and establish, in actuality, the principles of democratic centralism in the party by raising the ideological standard of the comrades to such an extent as to ensure discussion in dialogue." (On steps taken by CPSU against Stalin, p. 13)

Comrade Ghosh showed that the sense of authority has been confused with authoritarianism by most of the communists. But at the same time he pointed out that sense of ultra democracy is the other extreme of the same blind practice of authoritarianism. Both are contrary to

the real Marxist sense of authority. The present CPI(M) leaders who were once victim to this blind sense of authority are now practising worst form of ultra-democracy, i.e. revisionism while a section of them who came out from the party as Naxalites practised blind authoritarianism. Mr. Namboodiripad should understand that while the blind practice of authoritarianism of the Naxalites is nothing else than the legacy of his own party's tradition, the CPI(M)'s present day practice of ultra-democracy is also the other extreme of the same blind practice of authoritarianism.

Rally round SUCI that upholds the Revolutionary banner of Marxism-Leninism

So, we find that Mr. Namboodiripad nowhere positively answers questions but everywhere creates confusion about the SUCI. And there is reason for this. Their recent friendly relationship with the Janata Party, the constituents of which they considered to be forces of reaction and against whom they all through supported Indira Government even upto the declaration of the parliamentary poll, their painting of the Janata Government as 'friendly', their formation of coalition ministry with the Janata Party (practically with the defected members of the Congress now in Janata) in Tripura, as also their role in the West Bengal Government, their statements on gherao movement and strike and finally their open relationship with the monopoly houses as well as their growing relationship with the Soviet revisionist leadership and the CPI—all these are raising serious questions within their honest rank and file and the people. And at the same time revolutionary politics and the glorious role of the SUCI, its Marxist analysis about the danger of the 'two-party' system, and its his-

toric call to forestall the two-party system, a conspiracy of the ruling bourgeois class and its call to form United Front of all the left and democratic parties and forces, its firm stand of upholding the banner of Leftism when all the so-called communist parties joined the camp of the bourgeoisie and above all, the revolutionary teachings of its leader, teacher and guide Comrade Shibdas Ghosh are creating inspiration and encouragement in the toiling masses. Naturally a keen interest to know the revolutionary politics of the SUCI is increasingly growing among the people in general and the left minded people in particular. So, when the CPI(M), by its own role, is exposing its compromising role between labour and capital, i.e. its social democratic character more and more and in the background of that when the SUCI's revolutionary role is becoming clearer and clearer, the CPI(M) leader's attempt to create confusions about the politics of the SUCI, create wrong impressions about the party as a whole and ultimately create hatred against this party is quite natural. But there is nothing new in it. This is the age-old tactics of the petty-bourgeois social-democrats.

But all these attempts of distortions and pollutions of Marxism-Leninism, of revolutionary politics of the SUCI, have got another side as well which the revolutionaries cannot lose sight of. These remind them of their urgent task of mobilising all their strength to spread the revolutionary thoughts and teachings of Comrade Shibdas Ghosh within the proletariat and other exploited masses more vigorously, more rapidly and rally round the party of the proletariat, the SUCI, founded by him. Because, so long the toiling people will remain unconscious and unorganised the social democratic forces will get the opportunity to

Orissa State Conference of AIDSO Held with Great Enthusiasm

Sambalpur, December, 21:

The Orissa State Conference of AIDSO was held with great enthusiasm here at the Town Hall Maidan between 18th and 20th December '77. The delegate session on 18th and 19th and the open session was held on 20th December. More than five hundred student delegates from nearly 80 colleges and 50 schools all over Orissa joined the delegate session.

Apart from the main resolution 20 other resolutions on different problems concerning student's life and education in the state were adopted.

As the main speaker of the delegate session Comrade Provash Ghosh, President of the AIDSO narrated the glorious history of struggle of AIDSO and observed that for any real and fundamental solution of their problems the students must have to build up mighty student movements conducive to the growth and development of the revolutionary movement of the masses for accomplishing the task of anti-capitalist socialist revolution following the immortal teachings of the

great leader of the proletariat Comrade Shibdas Ghosh. For that purpose, to acquire a high standard of communist morality, ethics and culture and to grasp the teachings of Marxism-Leninism the students must have to realise and practise in their life the exemplary struggle conducted by Comrade Shibdas Ghosh.

On 20th December, Comrade Bishnupada Das, Vice President of Orissa AIDSO, presided over the open session and Comrade Chhaya Mukherji, General Secretary of AIDSO addressed the gathering in the Town Hall Maidan as the main speaker in the meeting.

As the Chief Guest of the meeting, Comrade Tapas Dutta Secretary, Orissa State Committee of the SUCI dwelt at length the basic difference of SUCI with the so-called communist parties in India like CPI, CPI(M) etc.

With Comrade Chitta Behera as the Secretary and Comrade Dhurjati Das as the President a fifteen member Executive Committee and a fifty five member State Council was elected at the Conference.

U P Teachers' Movement

(Contd. from Page 1)

be within the radius of one and two kilometres respectively, for the convenience of the students.

4) Democratisation of school administration should start from immediately replacing the 'personal' management in schools by democratically elected body composed of representatives from students, teachers and guardians.

5) 'Anchal Education Directorates' should be formed for speedy disposal of official business like employment, transfers, promotion of teachers etc.

distort and pollute Marxism-Leninism and mislead the struggles of the proletariat.

within the regions.

6) Framing of syllabus, conduction of examinations etc should not be left to individual institution but exclusively to the Board of Secondary Education.

7) Education should be made truly secular, scientific and democratic in content.

While hailing the heroic struggle of the UP teachers Comrade Tyagi has extended, on behalf of our party, firm support to their legitimate democratic movement and expressed the hope that they would resolutely carry on their just struggle. He has also appealed to the people to come out for upholding the cause of education.

Editor-in-Chief—NIHAR MUKHERJEE